	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	09/970,013	SAKAMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brook Kebede	2823
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>Brook Kebede</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. Chris T. Mizumoto.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>01 May 2003</u> .		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)⊠ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed:		
Identification of prior art discussed:		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) № N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>The Examiner is contacted Mr. Chris T. Mizumoto, attorney/represnative for applicant(s)</u> , in order to obtain approval for Exminer's amendment to change the claim language that is noncompliance. However, Mr. Chris T. Mizumoto advised the Examiner to issue an Office action. Therefore, the Office action that addressed the claim language that is noncompliance is issued in Paper No. 3.		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
	Lan	Kehede
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action		